The third law as a single inequality

Henrik Wilming[1] and Rodrigo Gallego[1]

[1]*Dahlem Center for Complex Quantum Systems, Freie Universität Berlin, 14195 Berlin, Germany*

The third law in the form of the unattainability principle states that exact ground-state cooling requires infinite resources. Here we investigate the amount of non-equilibrium resources needed for approximate cooling. We consider as resource any system out of equilibrium, allowing for resources beyond the *i.i.d.* assumption and including the input of work as a particular case. We establish sufficient conditions for cooling in full generality and show that for a vast class of non-equilibrium resources sufficient and necessary conditions for low-temperature cooling can be expressed in terms of a single function. This function plays a similar role for the third law to the one of the free energy for the second law. From a technical point of view we provide new results about concavity/convexity of certain Renyi-divergences, which might be of independent interest.

arXiv:1701.07478v2 [quant-ph] 27 Jan 2017

I. INTRODUCTION

Pure quantum states are indispensable resources for any task in quantum information processing. However, the third law of thermodynamics (more precisely, the unattainability principle) states that cooling a system exactly to zero temperature requires an infinite amount of resources, being it in the form of time, space, work or some other resource [1–5]. Similarly, no-go theorems have been put forward for the task of bit erasure –which is closely related to ground-state cooling– showing that no unitary process on a system and a finite dimensional reservoir can bring the system from a mixed to a pure state [6–8]. However, these no-go results do not say much about the amount of resources needed for approximate cooling. Indeed, in recent times a sizable number of studies deal with different protocols to cool a small quantum system by unitarily acting on heat bath and a certain number of systems out of equilibrium to be "used up" (known under the name of algorithmic or dynamical cooling) [9–13] or studying particular models of refrigerating small quantum systems [14–20], including ones that seem to challenge the unattainability principle in terms of required time [21–26].

In this work we will focus in quantifying in full generality the expenditure of arbitrary systems out of equilibrium that are needed for approximate cooling. Our scenario is similar to the one considered in algorithmic cooling, but here we treat the full thermodynamics of the problem by allowing for resources with non-trivial Hamiltonians and accounting for the energy conservation of the total process. We will do this in the resource theoretic framework of quantum thermodynamics [27–31], which has proven useful to answer a variety of fundamental questions in quantum thermodynamics, such as establishing an infinite family of second laws [32], providing fundamental bounds to single-shot thermodynamics [28, 32–34]Recently, there have also been studies from this viewpoint on the problem of cooling [3–5], however mostly focusing on providing necessary conditions in terms of resources such as time, space or Hilbert-space dimension.

The task of cooling that we are considering can be phrased as finding a cooling protocol between an arbitrary resource described by the state and Hamiltonian ρ_R and H_R, respectively, and a target system described by ρ_S and H_S so that ρ_S is a thermal state with temperature T_S as low as possible. We will assume that the density matrix of the resource has full rank because otherwise the problem trivializes, since one can, for example, simply swap with a ground-state [35]. We furthermore assume that the target system is initially in thermal equilibrium with some environment. Then the transition, *i.e.* the cooling protocol, can be performed by using a thermal bath at a fixed inverse temperature β and performing a global unitary that commutes with the total Hamiltonian, so that energy is properly accounted for. This kind of transitions have been extensively studied and they can be characterized by families of functions M^α, the so-called *monotones*, so that a transition is possible if and only if [32, 36, 37]

$$M^\alpha(\rho_R, H_R) \geq M^\alpha(\rho_S, H_S) \quad \forall\, \alpha. \tag{1}$$

Hence, the problem at hand is in principle hard to characterize since one needs to verify an infinite number of conditions to conclude that a given transition is possible. The main contribution of the present work is to show that in the limit where T_S is sufficiently close to zero –*i.e.* the regime where the (un)attainability problem is formulated– the infinite set of monotones appearing in (9) can be essentially reduced to a single monotone. We call this monotone the *vacancy* and it is defined as

$$\mathcal{V}_\beta(\rho, H) := S(\omega_\beta(H)\|\rho), \tag{2}$$

where $\omega_\beta(H)$ is the Gibbs state of at inverse temperature β and S is the relative entropy.

We find that *sufficient* and *necessary* conditions for cooling, respectively, are given by

$$\mathcal{V}_\beta(\rho_R, H_R) + K(\rho_R, H_R, \rho_S, H_S, \beta) \geq \mathcal{V}_\beta(\rho_S, H_S), \tag{3}$$

$$\mathcal{V}_\beta(\rho_R, H_R) \geq \mathcal{V}_\beta(\rho_S, H_S), \tag{4}$$

where $K(\rho_R, H_R, \rho_S, H_S, \beta) \to 0$ as $T_S \to 0$. Hence in the limit of very low temperature cooling $\mathcal{V}_\beta(\rho_S, H_S)$ is the key quantity that determines the fundamental limitations. Importantly, $\mathcal{V}_\beta(\rho_S, H_S)$ diverges as $T_S \to 0$. The necessary condition (4) therefore shows that an infinite amount of resources (as measured by $\mathcal{V}_\beta$) is necessary for exact ground-state cooling. Furthermore we show that for a vast class of resource systems, for example thermal states of coupled harmonic oscillators, the function $K(\rho_R, H_R, \rho_S, H_S, \beta)$ vanishes identically. Hence

$$\mathcal{V}_\beta(\rho_R, H_R) \geq \mathcal{V}_\beta(\rho_S, H_S) \tag{5}$$

becomes both a sufficient and necessary condition. That $\mathcal{V}_\beta$ plays an important role for the third law had been previously found in the setting of *i.i.d.* resources and qubits as target systems in the seminal work of Ref. [27]. Here, we extend the significance of the quantity $\mathcal{V}_\beta$ to arbitrary scenarios.

Usually, the unattainability principle is formulated with respect to time, argueing that an infinite amount of time (or infinitely many cycles of a periodically working machine) are needed to cool a system exactly to zero temperature. Our results show, for example, that if the non-equilibrium resources are simply hot thermal systems (as in the example of a thermal machine that operates between two heat baths), the system to be cooled and the cooling machine have to effectively interact with infinitely many such resource systems (or all parts of one infinitely large system). This implies that an infinite amout of time is needed, since each such interaction takes a finite time (see [3] for a thorough discussion of this point).

Our findings not only serve to pose limitations to protocols of algorithmic cooling, but also suggest a surprising symmetry between the second and third law of thermodynamics. The second law –in its averaged version or in the version of the Jarzynski equality [38]– can be expressed in terms of the free-energy difference defined as

$$\Delta F_\beta(\rho, H) = \frac{1}{\beta} S(\rho \| \omega_\beta(H)). \tag{6}$$

In analogy, we show that the third law can be expressed similarly in terms of $\mathcal{V}_\beta(\rho, H)$ which simply inverts the arguments of the relative entropy in Eq. (6) and drops the pre-factor. This symmetry between the second and third law is quite surprising and hints at the fact that the second and third law can be related to the errors of first and second kind in hypothesis testing [39]. We leave the investigation of this deeper relation between the two for future work.

From a technical point of view, our results rely on certain convexity-properties of the function $\alpha \mapsto S_\alpha(\rho||\sigma)$, where S_α are classical Renyi-divergences [39]. We believe that these results might be of independent interest.

II. SET-UP

In the following we will use the set-up of *catalytic thermal operations* [27, 28, 32] applied to the task of cooling. In this set-up we imagine to possess a resource given by the pair of state and Hamiltonian (ρ_R, H_R). We can then use an arbitrary thermal bath at inverse temperature β, that is, a system in a Gibbs state $\omega_\beta(H_B)$ of a Hamiltonian H_B, and finally an ancillary system, the so-called catalyst with arbitrary state and Hamiltonian (σ_C, H_C) in such a way the latter is returned in the same configuration and uncorrelated from the rest of the systems after implementing the protocol. The target system to be cooled is initially assumed to be in thermal equilibrium with the thermal bath and therefore described by a Gibbs state $(\omega_\beta(H_S), H_S)$. The total compound $RSBC$ is transformed by a cooling protocol, which consists simply of a unitary transformation U which commutes with the total Hamiltonian.

More formally, we say that exist that a cooling protocol to ρ_S if and only if there exist Hamiltonians H_B and H_C and an auxiliary state σ_C such that

$$\rho'_{RS} \otimes \sigma_C = \mathrm{Tr}_B \left(U \rho_R \otimes \omega_\beta(H_S) \otimes \omega_\beta(H_B) \otimes \sigma_C \, U^\dagger \right) \tag{7}$$

with $\mathrm{Tr}_R(\rho'_{RS}) = \rho_S$. The only constraint on the unitary U is that it conserves the global energy, i.e.,

$$[U, H_R + H_S + H_B + H_C] = 0. \tag{8}$$

Note that this formulation of the cooling process contains as a particular case partial cooling in which a we do not start with the target in a Gibbs state. In this case, the initial system of S, if it is partially cooled before starting the protocol, can be simply incorporated as a part of the resource R.

The problem of finding conditions for the existence of a transitions of the form (7) has been studied in Ref. [32] for diagonal states, that is, with $[\rho_R, H_R] = 0$ and $[\rho_S, H_S] = 0$. Throughout this manuscript we will restrict to such diagonal states, but we emphasize that the the necessary condition (4) also holds for non-diagonal states as we will see later.

Under the assumption that ρ_R and ρ_S are diagonal, one can show that cooling to a state ρ_S is possible if and only if

$$S_\alpha(\rho_R||\omega_\beta(H_R)) \geq S_\alpha(\rho_S||\omega_\beta(H_S)) \quad \forall \alpha \geq 0, \tag{9}$$

where S_α are so-called *Renyi-divergences*, which will be defined later. The proof of this statement relies simply in the results of Ref. [32] together with the additivity of the Renyi-divergences under tensor-products.

An important tool that appears in Eq. (9) is the concept of a *monotone* of (catalytic) thermal operations [27, 28]. This is any function f which can only decrease under (catalytic) thermal operations. The functions S_α appearing in (9) are monotones under catalytic thermal operations and more generally under any channel that has the Gibbs state as a fixed point. Importantly, any monotone f, possibly different from S_α, allows one to construct necessary conditions for a given transition. We will now show that $\mathcal{V}_\beta$ is also a monotone under catalytic thermal operations.

Lemma 1 (Monotonicity)**.** *The vacancy is an additive monotone under catalytic thermal operations.*

Proof. First note that the vacancy is only defined on full-rank states. From the additivity of the relative entropy under tensor-products it follows that the vacancy is additive over uncorrelated and non-interacting subsystems. Now let ρ be any full-rank state with associated Hamiltonian H_S and consider a thermal operation involving a catalyst σ_C that maps ρ to ρ'. Let the thermal operation be represented as the quantum channel $\mathcal{G}$ on the system and catalyst and assume for now that the catalyst has full rank as well. Since $\mathcal{G}$ maps Gibbs-states at the environment temperature to Gibbs-states at the environment temperature, we obtain from additivity and the data-

processing inequality

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{V}_\beta(\rho', H_S) + \mathcal{V}_\beta(\sigma_C, H_C) &= \mathcal{V}_\beta(\rho' \otimes \sigma_C, H_S + H_C) \\ &= S(\mathcal{G}(\omega_\beta(H_S) \otimes \omega_\beta(H_C)) \| \mathcal{G}(\rho \otimes \sigma_C)) \\ &\leq S(\omega_\beta(H_S) \otimes \omega_\beta(H_C) \| \rho \otimes \sigma_c) \\ &= \mathcal{V}_\beta(\rho, H_S) + \mathcal{V}_\beta(\sigma_C, H_C).\end{aligned}$$

Canceling the terms $\mathcal{V}_\beta(\sigma_C, H_C)$ we obtain $\mathcal{V}_\beta(\rho', H_S) \leq \mathcal{V}_\beta(\rho, H_S)$. The above argument does not work in case that σ_C does not have full rank, since in this case $\mathcal{V}_\beta(\sigma_C, H_C) = \infty$. We show in appendix A, however, that catalysts can always be chosen to have full rank. This finishes the proof. □

Knowing that the vacancy is a monotone under catalytic thermal operations, we can now easily derive a necessary condition for cooling by applying the vacancy to the resource and system:

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{V}_\beta\left(\rho_R \otimes \omega_\beta(H_S), H_R + H_S\right) \\ &\quad \geq \mathcal{V}_\beta\left(\rho'_{RS}, H_R + H_S\right) \\ &\quad \geq \mathcal{V}_\beta\left(\omega_\beta(H_R) \otimes \rho_S, H_R + H_S\right).\end{aligned}$$

Here, the last inequality follows from the fact that one can always replace the state on any system by an uncorrelated thermal state at the heat bath's temperature using a thermal operation. Using additivity of vacancy and the fact that $\mathcal{V}_\beta(\omega_\beta(H), H) = 0$, we find that a necessary condition for cooling is given by

$$\mathcal{V}_\beta(\rho_R, H_R) \geq \mathcal{V}_\beta(\rho_S, H_S). \tag{10}$$

Note that this condition is derived in full generality and it applies to any full-rank ρ_R and ρ_S, possibly not diagonal. The monotone $\mathcal{V}_\beta$ was first introduced in Ref. [27]. Its relevance for the unattainability principle is clear since if ρ_S does not have full support, then the r.h.s. of (10) diverges. Hence, exact cooling is impossible unless the resource ρ_R does not have full support either. In the particular case of $\rho_R = \bigotimes_{i=1}^n \varrho^i$ where ϱ^i has full support, the condition (10) already tell us that we need infinite resources –infinite n in this case– for exact cooling. Hence, such a simple analysis already suggests that the quantity $\mathcal{V}_\beta$ plays a crucial role for the limitations on cooling.

To summarize, we have seen, building upon previous literature, that the vacancy $\mathcal{V}_\beta$ establishes necessary conditions for cooling. However, for necessary and sufficient conditions one should in principle verify an infinite number of inequalities given by (9). Our contribution will be to show that these infinite number of inequalities can be reduced to a single one, which can also be expressed in terms of the vacancy for a sufficiently cold final state ρ_S. Furthermore, we will show that for a large family of resource systems the single sufficient condition the we find coincides with the necessary (10). Hence, the limits on cooling are entirely ruled by the function $\mathcal{V}_\beta$. This holds for large classes of finite systems, with possibly correlated and interacting subsystems.

III. GENERAL SUFFICIENT CONDITIONS FOR COOLING

The process of cooling laid out in the previous section can in principle be applied to any final state ρ_S. We will now assume for simplicity that the final state, as it corresponds to a cooling process, is of the form $\rho_S = \omega_{\beta_S}(H_S)$ with β_S very large. We can then derive the following completely general sufficient condition for cooling.

Theorem 2 (General sufficient condition for cooling)**.** *For every choice of β and H_S there is a critical $\beta_{\rm cr} > 0$ such that for any $\beta_S > \beta_{\rm cr}$ and full-rank resource (ρ_R, H_R) the condition*

$$\mathcal{V}_\beta(\rho_R, H_R) + K(\beta_S, \beta, \rho_R, H_R, H_S) \geq \mathcal{V}_\beta(\omega_{\beta_S}(H_S), H_S) \tag{11}$$

is sufficient *for cooling. The function K has the property $K(\beta_S, \beta, \rho_R, H_R) \to 0$ as $\beta_S \to \infty$ for any fixed $\beta, H_R, \rho_R > 0$ and H_S.*

The proof of the theorem is given in Sec. VI. Nonetheless we provide a sketch of the main ideas involved in such a proof at the end of this section. The function K is given by

$$K(\beta_S, \beta, \rho_R, H_R, H_S) = \min\left\{0, \left(\min_{\alpha \leq \delta(\beta_S)} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \alpha^2} S_\alpha(\rho_R \| \omega_\beta(H_R))\right) \delta(\beta_S)\right\},$$

where

$$\delta(\beta_S) := \log(Z_\beta)/\mathcal{V}_\beta(\omega_{\beta_S}(H_S), H_S), \quad Z_\beta = \mathrm{Tr}(\mathrm{e}^{-\beta H_S}).$$

The bound (11) applies for any possible (diagonal) resource state, however finding $K(\beta_S, \beta, \rho_R, H_R, H_S)$ involves a minimization that although is feasible for low dimensional systems, might be an obstacle for practical purposes when dealing with large systems and for values of β_S so that $K(\beta_S, \beta, \rho_R, H_R, H_S)$ cannot be neglected. That said, we will investigate kinds of resource systems ρ_R, H_R for which $K(\beta_S, \beta, \rho_R, H_R, H_S) = 0$. In those cases, the general sufficient condition given by (11) taken together with the necessary condition (5) will imply that that a *necessary* and *sufficient* condition is given simply by

$$\mathcal{V}_\beta(\rho_R, H_R) \geq \mathcal{V}_\beta(\rho_S, H_S), \tag{12}$$

In particular, we will see in the next section, that this holds true for large classes of thermal resources. Let us also note that $K(\beta_S, \beta, \rho_R, H_R, H_S)$, just as the vacancy, is additive over non-interacting and uncorrelated resources. We will use this property in section V to investigate the setting of i.i.d-resources.

In the result given above, we have focused on thermal target states. This is in fact not necessary. We show in the appendix F that a completely analogous result holds for states of the form

$$\rho_\epsilon = (1 - \epsilon)\, |0\rangle\langle 0| + \epsilon \rho^\perp, \quad \epsilon \ll 1. \tag{13}$$

where $\rho^\perp$ is any density matrix which has full rank on the subspace orthogonal to the ground-state $|0\rangle$ and commutes with H_S.



FIG. 1. The figure shows the behavior of $S_\alpha(\rho_S = \omega_{\beta_S}(H_S)\|\omega_\beta(H_S))$ (orange) and $S_\alpha(\rho_R\|\omega_\beta(H_R))$ (blue). **The left plot** shows a target state that is not very cold together with an insufficient resource. The transition is not possible since the blue line is below the orange line for $\alpha \lesssim 1.25$. **The right plot** shows the behavior when ρ_S becomes very cold. The function becomes more similar to a step function. The fact that $S_\alpha(\rho_R\|\omega_\beta(H_R))$ (blue curve) is larger than the orange curve, which implies that the transition is possible, is determined by the behavior at very small values of α, and up to a small error, by the fact that the derivate is larger at $\alpha = 0$.

A. Sketch of the proof of Thm. 2

As we have seen in the previous section, a set of sufficient conditions for a transition with catalytic thermal operations is given by the infinite set of inequalities of (9). The main idea behind the proof is that when the target system is sufficiently cold ($\beta_S > \beta_{\text{cr}}$) it suffices to check the conditions (9) for very small α. This follows from the fact that for $\beta_S > \beta_{\text{cr}}$ the r.h.s. of (9), given by $S_\alpha(\rho_S\|\omega_\beta(H_S))$, rapidly saturates to its maximum value as we increase α and it is concave (see Fig. 1). Given that one only needs to consider small values of α it is possible to make a Taylor expansion around $\alpha = 0$ of S_α of the form

$$S_\alpha(\rho_R\|\omega_\beta(H)) \approx S_0(\rho\|\omega_\beta(H)) + \left.\frac{\partial S_\alpha(\rho\|\omega_\beta(H))}{\partial\alpha}\right|_{\alpha=0}\alpha + k(\beta_S,\beta,\rho_R,H_R,H_S)\,\alpha^2. \tag{14}$$

This reduces the infinite inequalities of (1) to a single one that depends on the derivate of S_α and an error term k, that is related to the error term appearing in Thm. 2 denoted by K. This expansion can be further simplified noting that $S_{\alpha=0}(\rho\|\omega_\beta(H)) = 0$. The vacancy comes into play because of the identity

$$\left.\frac{\partial S_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma)}{\partial\alpha}\right|_{\alpha=0} = S_1(\sigma\|\rho), \tag{15}$$

which inverts the arguments of the second term on the r.h.s. of (14). Taking all these elements into account and accounting properly for the precision of the Taylor approximations we arrive at an inequality involving only the vacancy and a vanishing error term as determined by Thm. 2.

IV. THERMAL RESOURCES

We now consider as resource state ρ_R a (possibly multipartite) thermal state of some Hamiltonian H_R at inverse temperature β_R. In the following we will derive a simple expression that allows us to check whether

$$K(\beta_S,\beta,\rho_R,H_R,H_S) \geq 0.\ \forall\rho_S,H_S \tag{16}$$

and hence (10) becomes a necessary and sufficient condition. The reasoning is based on showing that

$$S_\alpha(\rho_R = \omega_{\beta_R}(H_R)||\omega_\beta(H_R)) \tag{17}$$

is convex for a given range of $\alpha < 1$, which implies (16). The convexity of (17) can be determined by looking at the convexity of the average energy as a function of the inverse temperature of the resource

$$x \mapsto E_x^R := \text{Tr}(\omega_x(H_R)H_R). \tag{18}$$

In particular, we will see that whenever $\beta_R < \beta$ and the function $x \mapsto E_x^R$ is convex for $x \in [\beta_R,\beta]$ the function $S_\alpha(\omega_{\beta_R}(H_R)||\omega_\beta(H_R))$ is convex for all $\alpha < 1$.

Theorem 3. *For resources of the form $(\omega_{\beta_R}(H_R),H_R)$ that are hotter than the bath, that is with $\beta_R \leq \beta$, if $E_x^R = \text{Tr}(\omega_x(H_R)H_R)$ is convex in the range $x \in [\beta_R,\beta]$, then* (10) *is a sufficient and necessary condition for low temperature cooling.*

This Theorem simplifies considerably the task of formulating bounds on the third law, since the average energy for thermal states is easy to compute for many systems. In Sec. IV A we discuss several classes of physically motivated conditions that imply that $E_x^R = \text{Tr}(\omega_x(H_R)H_R)$ is convex.

Lastly, let us mention that condition (16) is fulfilled if, for a fixed β_R, the bath's inverse temperature β is sufficiently large, without any extra assumption on the convexity of E_x. This implies, that for sufficiently cold baths, (10) is also a sufficient and necessary condition. This is shown in Appendix C, together with several properties of the Renyi divergences for thermal states that might be of independent interest and also include a proof of Thm. 3.

A. Systems for which the energy is convex

As implied by Cor. 3, a sufficient and necessary condition for cooling is given by eq. (10) if the resource is a system that is hotter than the heat bath and whose average thermal energy is convex in the inverse temperature. We will see the convexity of the energy is fulfilled by a wide range of physical models. This is due to the following Lemma, which we prove in the appendix.

Lemma 4 (Equidistant levels)**.** *Consider any Hamiltonian with equidistant and non-degenerate energy levels. Then the function $\beta \mapsto E_\beta$ is convex.*

Immediate examples of Hamiltonians with equidistant energy levels are two-level systems or harmonic oscillators. But in fact, the lemma covers a much wider class of models since the vacancy is unitarily invariant and additive over non-interacting subsystems. It follows that also any harmonic system and any system described by free fermions has a convex

energy function, since free bosonic and fermionic systems can always be made non-interacting by a normal-mode decomposition. In such a normal-mode decomposition they simply correspond to a collection of non-interacting harmonic oscillators or two-level systems, respectively. Nevertheless, these systems include highly-correlated (even entangled) systems and no thermodynamic limit needs to be taken. A particularly interesting resource that is included by these results is that of hot thermal light, which has been considered before as a valuable resource for cooling [18].

It can furthermore be checked that for large but finite many-body systems whose density of states in the bulk is well approximated by $\mu(\epsilon) \simeq \mathrm{e}^{\gamma\epsilon-\alpha\epsilon^2}$ the average energy E_β is convex in β [40].

Finally, for every finite system there is a critical β_c such that E_β is convex for all $\beta > \beta_c$. Thus as soon as $\beta > \beta_R > \beta_c$, the sufficient condition (10) holds for small enough target temperatures.

B. A source of work

Our formalism can also incorporate a source of work as particular case of a resource for cooling. The limitations on cooling as a function of the input of work have been studied in Ref. [3]. There it is shown that the fluctuations of work, rather than its average value, have to diverge when the target state reaches vanishing final temperature. We will here derive a result similar in spirit using Thm. 2, although we employ a different model for the work source.

Let us model the work source by a system R with Hamiltonian

$$H_R^w = \sum_{x=-d/2}^{d/2} \frac{Ex}{d} \left|\frac{Ex}{d}\right\rangle\!\left\langle\frac{Ex}{d}\right|. \tag{19}$$

One can see this Hamiltonian as d-dimensional harmonic oscillators with energies bounded between $E/2$ and $-E/2$. We are interested in the limit of $d \to \infty$. In this case R is similar to the model put forward in Ref. [3, 16], with the solely difference that we consider we consider here a finite value of E. We enforce the condition that the battery acts as a energy reservoir and not as an entropy sink (that would make the task of cooling trivial) by assuming the work source to be in state $\rho_R^w = \mathbb{I}/d$. These assumptions on the work source are justified by the fact that it fulfills the second law of thermodynamics. This is shown in Appendix E.

Now we will show that the third law can be obtained, in the sense that both E and d have to diverge in order to be able to use R to cool down a system to zero final temperature. Let us first recall that by Lemma 4 a sufficient and necessary condition for cooling for such a resource is given by (10). Furthermore, the vacancy of the work source is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{V}_\beta(\rho_R^w, H_R^w) &= S(\omega_\beta(H_R^w)\|\mathbb{I}/d)\\ &= \mathrm{Tr}\left(\omega_\beta(H_R^w)(\log(\omega_\beta(H_R^w) - \log(\mathbb{I}/d))\right)\\ &= -\beta\mathrm{Tr}\left(\omega_\beta(H_R^w)H_R^w\right) + \log(d) - \log(Z_\beta(H_R^w))\\ &\leq -\beta E/2 + \log(d) - \log(Z_\beta(H_R^w)).\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

We compute the partition function can be upper bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}Z_\beta(H_R^w) &= \sum_{x=-d/2}^{d/2} e^{-\beta\frac{Ex}{d}} &(21)\\ &\geq e^{\beta E/2} + (d-1)e^{-\beta E/2} &(22)\\ &= e^{\beta E/2} d\left(\frac{1}{d} + \frac{d-1}{d}e^{-\beta E}\right). &(23)\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we find that

$$\mathcal{V}_\beta(\rho_R^w, H_R^w) \leq -\log\left(\frac{1}{d} + \frac{d-1}{d}e^{-\beta E}\right). \tag{24}$$

This combined by (10) implies that a necessary condition for cooling to a state ρ_S is given by

$$\mathcal{V}_\beta(\rho_S, H_S) \leq -\log\left(\frac{1}{d} + \frac{d-1}{d}e^{-\beta E}\right). \tag{25}$$

Most importantly, note that in order to obtain a state ρ_S that is close to a Gibbs state at zero temperature the r.h.s. of (25). For this both E and d have to diverge. Since

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{d\to\infty} \mathcal{V}_\beta(\rho_R^w, H_R^w) &\leq \beta E, &(26)\\ \lim_{E\to\infty} \mathcal{V}_\beta(\rho_R^w, H_R^w) &\leq \log(d). &(27)\end{aligned}$$

This implies the unattainability principle in the sense that an infinite dense and with unbounded energy is needed for cooling to absolute zero.

V. INDEPENDENT AND IDENTICALLY-DISTRIBUTED RESOURCES

We will now investigate the scaling of the limits for cooling when the resource state is given by $\rho_R = \varrho_R^{\otimes n}$ and Hamiltonian $H_R = \sum_i H_R^i$ where $H_R^i = \mathbb{I}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{I}_{i-1} \otimes h_R \otimes \mathbb{I}_{i+1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{I}_n$. Let us know consider the following task: Given fixed $\varrho_R, H_R, \beta, H_S$, find the minimum n so that it is possible to cool down the target state to inverse temperature β_S. Already the necessary condition for cooling (10) together with additivity of $\mathcal{V}_\beta$ poses lower bounds on the necessary number of copies $n^{\mathrm{nec}}(\beta_S)$ as

$$n^{\mathrm{nec}}(\beta_S) = \frac{\mathcal{V}_\beta(\omega_{\beta_S}(H_S), H_S)}{\mathcal{V}_\beta(\varrho_R, h_R)}. \tag{28}$$

The contribution of Thm. 2 in the *i.i.d.* setting is to be able to giving us a sufficient number of copies n^{suff}. The condition (11) takes the form

$$n[\mathcal{V}_\beta(\varrho_R, h_R) + K(\beta_S, \beta, \varrho_R, h_R, H_S)] \geq \mathcal{V}_\beta(\omega_{\beta_S}(H_S), H_S).$$

Since this condition is sufficient, but not always necessary, we obtain

$$n^{\mathrm{suff}}(\beta_S) \leq \frac{\mathcal{V}_\beta(\omega_{\beta_S}(H_S), H_S)}{\mathcal{V}_\beta(\varrho_R, h_R) + K(\beta_S, \beta, \varrho_R, h_R, H_S)}. \tag{29}$$

Since the correction K goes to zero as $\beta_S \to \infty$ (the target temperature going to zero), we see that

$$\lim_{\beta_S \to \infty} \frac{n^{\text{suff}}(\beta_S)}{n^{\text{nec}}(\beta_S)} = 1. \tag{30}$$

It is then interesting to know how n^{nec} scales with the target temperature. We will see in the next section that n^{nec} and n^{suff} scale as β_S for large β_S.

A. Vacancy as free energies and the scaling of the vacancy

In the special case of thermal resource and target states, we can reformulate the vacancy, and hence the necessary and sufficient condition, also in terms of non-equilibrium free energies. This allows to use the large body of results in statistical mechanics to check the condition. Indeed, the vacancy of a thermal state at temperature β_S simply takes the form

$$\mathcal{V}_\beta(\omega_{\beta_S}(H), H) = \beta_S \Delta F_{\beta_S}(\omega_\beta(H_S), H_S), \tag{31}$$

with $\Delta F_\beta(\rho, H) = \langle H \rangle_\rho - \langle H \rangle_\beta - (S(\rho) - S(\omega_\beta))/\beta$.

In this case the condition (10) reads:

$$\Delta F_{\beta_R}(\omega_\beta(H_R), H_R) \geq \frac{\beta_S}{\beta_R} \Delta F_{\beta_S}(\omega_\beta(H_S), H_S). \tag{32}$$

From (31) we see that for large β_S we have (assuming vanishing ground-state energy)

$$\mathcal{V}_\beta(\omega_{\beta_S}(H), H) = \beta_S E_\beta, \quad \text{as } \beta_S \to \infty. \tag{33}$$

Assuming a resource system of n non-interacting identical particles each described by $(\omega_{\beta_R}(h_R), h_R)$, we hence obtain that the minimum achievable temperature scales as

$$n k_B T_S = \frac{E_\beta^S}{\mathcal{V}_\beta(\omega_{\beta_R}(h_R), h_R)}, \quad T_S \ll 1. \tag{34}$$

This result is similar to the asymptotic result of Janzing et al. [27].

VI. PROOF OF THM. 2

We will now proof Thm. 2. Before we go to the details, let us first explain the general logic behind the result. It is clear that to obtain a single necessary and sufficient condition for cooling at low temperatures, we have to show that the infinite set of second laws in eq. (9) collapse to a single condition. The first important step in the proof is the following Lemma.

Lemma 5 (Concavity at low temperatures)**.** *Let $\beta > 0$ and a Hamiltonian H_S with ground-state degeneracy g_0 be given. There exists a critical inverse temperature β_{cr} such that for all $\beta_S > \beta_{\text{cr}}$ and for all $0 < \alpha < \delta(\beta_S)$ we have*

$$\alpha \mapsto S''_\alpha(\omega_{\beta_S} \| \omega_\beta) \leq 0. \tag{35}$$

and

$$S_\infty(\omega_{\beta_S} \| \omega_\beta) \leq \log Z_\beta. \tag{36}$$

Here, the critical value $\delta(\beta_S)$ is given by

$$\delta(\beta_S) = \frac{\log(Z_\beta)}{\mathcal{V}_\beta(\omega_{\beta_S}(H_S), H_S)}. \tag{37}$$

Proof. See appendix B. □

Using this result, we can now *upper bound* the Renyi-divergence on the target by its linear approximation at the origin in this parameter regime. Since $S'_0(\rho || \omega_\beta(H)) = S(\omega_\beta(H) || \rho) = \mathcal{V}_\beta(\rho, H)$, we get

$$S_\alpha(\omega_{\beta_S}(H_S) || \omega_\beta(H_S)) \leq \mathcal{V}_\beta(\omega_{\beta_S}(H_S), H_S)\alpha, \quad \alpha \leq \alpha_c. \tag{38}$$

Secondly, for small enough target temperatures we also have $S_\infty(\omega_{\beta_S}(H_S) || \omega_\beta(H_S)) \leq \mathcal{V}_\beta(\omega_{\beta_S}(H_S), H_S)\alpha_c$. Since $\alpha \mapsto S_\alpha$ is monotonously increasing, the second laws eq. (9) are hence also satisfied if

$$S_\alpha(\rho_R || \omega_\beta(H_R)) > \mathcal{V}_\beta(\omega_{\beta_S}(H_S), H_S)\alpha, \quad \alpha \leq \alpha_c. \tag{39}$$

Indeed, for small temperatures, we can further restrict the range of α to the interval $[0, \delta(\beta_S))$, where $\delta(\beta_S)$ is given by:

$$\delta(\beta_S) = \frac{S_\infty(\omega_{\beta_S}(H_S) || \omega_\beta(H_S))}{\mathcal{V}_\beta(\omega_{\beta_S}(H_S), H_S)}. \tag{40}$$

The final step now is given by arguing that the Renyi-divergence of the *resource* $S_\alpha(\rho_R || \omega_\beta(H_R))$ is approximately *convex* in α for $\alpha < \delta(\beta_S)$. In particular, if we knew that it was convex (such as in the vase where E_β^R is convex), we could *lower* bound it by its linear approximation at the origin and obtain the necessary and sufficient condition (10).

For the general case we will use that we only have to check small values of α and simply Taylor expand $S_\alpha(\rho_R || \omega_\beta(H_R))$ and use Taylor's theorem to obtain

$$S''_\alpha(\rho_R || \omega_\beta(H_R)) \geq \mathcal{V}_\beta(\rho_R, H_R)\alpha - k(\beta_S, \beta, \rho_R, H_R)\alpha^2. \tag{41}$$

This yields as new *sufficient* condition

$$\mathcal{V}_\beta(\rho_R, H_R)\alpha + k(\beta_S, \beta, \rho_R, H_R)\alpha^2 \geq \mathcal{V}_\beta(\omega_{\beta_S}(H_S), H_S)\alpha,$$

for all $0 < \alpha \leq \delta(\beta_S)$. Here, the function $k(\beta_S, \beta, \rho_R, H_R) \leq 0$ is given by

$$k(\beta_S, \beta, \rho_R, H_R) = \min\left\{0, \min_{\alpha \leq \delta(\beta_S)} S''_\alpha(\rho_R \| \omega_\beta(H_R))\right\}.$$

We can now divide the sufficient condition by α and, since $k(\beta_S, \beta, \rho_R, H_R) \leq 0$, replace α by $\delta(\beta_S)$ to arrive at the final sufficient condition

$$\mathcal{V}_\beta(\rho_R, H_R) + K(\beta_S, \beta, \rho_R, H_R, H_S) \geq \mathcal{V}_\beta(\omega_{\beta_S}(H_S), H_S),$$

with $K(\beta_S, \beta, \rho_R, H_R, H_S) = k(\beta_S, \beta, \rho_R, H_R)\delta(\beta_S)$. This finishes the proof. □

VII. SUMMARY

In this work we have investigated the limits on low temperature cooling when arbitrary systems out of equilibrium are used as a resource. We provide sufficient and necessary conditions that establish novel upper and lower bounds on the amount of resources that are needed to cool a system close to its ground state. We found that the limitations are ruled by a single quantity, namely the vacancy. This is remarkable, since at higher temperatures there is an infinite family of "second laws" that need to be checked to determine whether a non-equilibrium state transition is possible.

We have only focused on the amount of non-equilibrium resources, as we assume access to an infinite heat bath and we leave considerations about the time and complexity of cooling protocol aside. These other kind of resources have been explored in other complementary works on the third law [3–6]. It would be interesting to see if the the vacancy plays a role to express the limitations in the size of the heat bath or any other resources that diverge when cooling a system to absolute zero. More particularly, it is an interesting question for future work to obtain the optimal sufficient scaling of the size of the heat bath and the potential "catalyst" τ that is needed to cool the system to the final low temperature [41].

Lastly, the results of Sec. IV suggests that for a large class of physically relevant systems the third law can be expressed simply as the monotonicity of the vacancy. It would be of interest to specify more general assumptions on a many-body system so that this is the case. On the other hand, there exist systems for which the vacancy is not sufficient condition. This open the possibility to have families of resources that, although are out of equilibrium, are useless for cooling. We have some evidence that this families of states might exist, but we leave it as an open question for future work.

Acknowledgments. We thank Lluis Masanes, Joseph M. Renes and Jens Eisert for interesting discussions and valuable feedback. This work has been supported by the ERC (TAQ), the DFG (GA 2184/2-1) and the Studienstiftung des Deutschen Volkes.

[1] W. Nernst, Nachr. Kgl. Ges. Wiss. Gtt. , 1 (1906).
[2] W. Nernst, Ber. Kgl. Pr. Akad. Wiss. , 933 (1906).
[3] L. Masanes and J. Oppenheim, "A derivation (and quantification) of the third law of thermodynamics," (2014), arXiv:1412.3828.
[4] J. Scharlau and M. P. Mueller, (2016), 1605.06092.
[5] R. Silva, G. Manzano, P. Skrzypczyk, and N. Brunner, (2016), 1604.04098.
[6] C. Di Franco and M. Paternostro, Scientific Reports **3** (2013), 10.1038/srep01387.
[7] L.-A. Wu, D. Segal, and P. Brumer, Scientific Reports **3** (2013), 10.1038/srep01824.
[8] F. Ticozzi and L. Viola, Scientific Reports **4** (2014), 10.1038/srep05192.
[9] L. J. Schulman and U. V. Vazirani, Proceedings of the thirty-first annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing - STOC 99 (1999), 10.1145/301250.301332.
[10] P. O. Boykin, T. Mor, V. Roychowdhury, F. Vatan, and R. Vrijen, PNAS **99**, 33883393 (2002).
[11] L. J. Schulman, T. Mor, and Y. Weinstein, Physical Review Letters **94** (2005), 10.1103/physrevlett.94.120501.
[12] A. E. Allahverdyan, K. V. Hovhannisyan, D. Janzing, and G. Mahler, Phys. Rev. E **84** (2011), 10.1103/physreve.84.041109.
[13] S. Raeisi and M. Mosca, Physical Review Letters **114** (2015), 10.1103/physrevlett.114.100404.
[14] A. E. Allahverdyan, K. Hovhannisyan, and G. Mahler, Phys. Rev. E **81** (2010), 10.1103/physreve.81.051129.
[15] N. Linden, S. Popescu, and P. Skrzypczyk, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 130401 (2010).
[16] P. Skrzypczyk, N. Brunner, N. Linden, and S. Popescu, J. Phys. A **44**, 492002 (2011).
[17] A. Levy, R. Alicki, and R. Kosloff, Phys. Rev. E **85** (2012), 10.1103/physreve.85.061126.
[18] A. Mari and J. Eisert, Physical Review Letters **108** (2012), 10.1103/physrevlett.108.120602.
[19] R. Silva, P. Skrzypczyk, and N. Brunner, Phys. Rev. E **92** (2015), 10.1103/physreve.92.012136.
[20] P. P. Hofer, M. Perarnau-Llobet, J. B. Brask, R. Silva, M. Huber, and N. Brunner, (2016), 1607.05218.
[21] B. Cleuren, B. Rutten, and C. Van den Broeck, Physical Review Letters **108** (2012), 10.1103/physrevlett.108.120603.
[22] A. E. Allahverdyan, K. V. Hovhannisyan, and G. Mahler, Physical Review Letters **109** (2012), 10.1103/physrevlett.109.248903.
[23] A. Levy, R. Alicki, and R. Kosloff, Physical Review Letters **109** (2012), 10.1103/physrevlett.109.248901.
[24] O. Entin-Wohlman and Y. Imry, Physical Review Letters **112** (2014), 10.1103/physrevlett.112.048901.
[25] B. Cleuren, B. Rutten, and C. Van den Broeck, Physical Review Letters **109** (2012), 10.1103/physrevlett.109.248902.
[26] M. Kol, D. Gelbwaser-Klimovsky, R. Alicki, and G. Kurizki, Physical Review Letters **109** (2012), 10.1103/physrevlett.109.090601.
[27] D. Janzing, P. Wocjan, R. Zeier, R. Geiss, and T. Beth, Int. J. Th. Phys. **39**, 2717 (2000).
[28] M. Horodecki and J. Oppenheim, Nature Comm. **4**, 2059 (2013).
[29] G. Gour, M. P. Mller, V. Narasimhachar, R. W. Spekkens, and N. Yunger Halpern, Physics Reports **583**, 158 (2015).
[30] N. Y. Halpern, (2014), 1409.7845.
[31] N. Yunger Halpern and J. M. Renes, Phys. Rev. E **93** (2016), 10.1103/physreve.93.022126.
[32] F. G. S. L. Brandao, M. Horodecki, N. H. Y. Ng, J. Oppenheim, and S. Wehner, PNAS **112**, 3275 (2015).
[33] P. Faist, F. Dupuis, J. Oppenheim, and R. Renner, Nature Comm. **6**, 7669 (2015).
[34] N. Y. Halpern, A. J. P. Garner, O. C. O. Dahlsten, and V. Vedral, New J. Phys. **17**, 095003 (2015).
[35] Similar arguments can be made for other states without full rank. For example two copies of a rank-2 state in a 4-dimensional system can be written as a pure state in tensor product with a full-rank state. Such a resource therefore already contains a pure state which can then be mapped to the ground-

state.
[36] F. Buscemi and G. Gour, "Quantum relative lorenz curves," (2016), arXiv:1607.05735.
[37] G. Gour, "Quantum resource theories in the single-shot regime," (2016), arXiv:1610.04247.
[38] C. Jarzynski, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 2690 (1997).
[39] M. Tomamichel, SpringerBriefs in Mathematical Physics (2016), 10.1007/978-3-319-21891-5.
[40] Such a density of states is typical for many-body systems in the bulk of the energy, but deviations typically do appear in the tails of the distribution.
[41] N. H. Y. Ng, L. Maninska, C. Cirstoiu, J. Eisert, and S. Wehner, New J. Phys. **17**, 085004 (2015).

Appendix A: Catalysts can always be chosen with full rank

In this section, we show that in our setting catalysts can always be chosen to have full rank. I.e., whenever cooling can be achieved with a catalyst without full-rank there exists a catalyst with full rank and a different Hamiltonian that also achieves it. To see this, consider a bi-partite system with non-interacting Hamiltonian $H_1 + H_2$. Then consider the initial state $\rho_{SB} \otimes \sigma_C$ and apply an energy-preserving unitary operation U that results in the state ρ'_{SBC} with $\rho'_C = \sigma_C$. Here, we imagine that ρ_{SB} also includes the state of the heat-bath and thus there can be a built-up of correlations between the catalyst and ρ_{SB}. Furthermore assume that ρ_{SB} has full-rank and that σ_C is supported only on a subspace $P \subset \mathcal{H}_2$ with complement $Q = \mathbf{1} - P$ (we identify the vector-space and the projector on the space). Thus $P = \sum_j |j\rangle\langle j|$, where the sum is over the eigen-states of σ_C. Let the spectrum of ρ_{SB} and σ_C be $\{p_\alpha\}$ and $\{q_j\}$, respectively. Then the final state

$$\rho'_{SBC} = \sum_{\alpha,j} p_\alpha q_j U\, |\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha| \otimes |j\rangle\langle j|\, U^\dagger \tag{A1}$$

is a convex sum of the positive semi-definite operators $U\, |\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha| \otimes |j\rangle\langle j|\, U^\dagger$. The sum has support only within $\mathbf{1} \otimes P$ since otherwise the reduced state ρ'_C would also be supported outside of P. Hence also every summand is supported within $\mathbf{1} \otimes P$. Using $\mathbf{1} \otimes P = \sum_{\alpha,j} |\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha| \otimes |j\rangle\langle j|$ we then obtain

$$(\mathbf{1} \otimes Q)U(\mathbf{1} \otimes P)U^\dagger = \mathbf{1} \otimes Q \sum_{\alpha,j} U\, |\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha| \otimes |j\rangle\langle j|\, U^\dagger = 0. \tag{A2}$$

In other words, we have $(\mathbf{1} \otimes Q)U(\mathbf{1} \otimes P) = 0$ and by a similar calculation also $(\mathbf{1} \otimes P)U(\mathbf{1} \otimes Q) = 0$. Thus, the unitary U is block-diagonal. In particular, the operator $V = (\mathbf{1} \otimes P)U(\mathbf{1} \otimes P)$ considered as an operator on the Hilbert-space $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes P$ is unitary. Since U is energy-preserving by assumption, we can deduce that $P = \mathrm{span}\{|E_j\rangle\}$ for some subset of energy-eigenstates $|E_j\rangle$ of the Hamiltonian H_2 of the catalyst.

Then V commutes with the Hamiltonian $H_1 + H_2|_P$, where $H_2|_P$ denotes the Hamiltonian of the catalyst, but restricted to the subspace P.

We can thus obtain an equivalent catalyst with full rank and a corresponding thermal operation by restricting σ_C and H_2 to the subspace P on which σ_C has full rank and using the thermal operation defined by V:

$$V \rho_{SB} \otimes \sigma_C|_P V^\dagger = \rho'_{SBC}|_{\mathbf{1}\otimes P}. \tag{A3}$$

In particular note that the above analysis also shows that pure catalysts are useless: If a transition can be done with a pure catalyst, it can also be done without a catalyst.

Appendix B: Proof of concavity of Renyi divergence for low temperatures

In this section we proof the Lemma 5 about concavity of the Renyi-divergence at low temperatures. The Lemma holds for any Hamiltonian with pure point spectrum, a gap above the ground-state and the property that the partition sum exists for any positive temperature.

Lemma 6 (Concavity at low temperatures)**.** *Let $\beta > 0$ and a Hamiltonian H_S with ground-state degeneracy g_0 be given. There exists a critical inverse temperature β_{cr} such that for all $\beta_S > \beta_{\mathrm{cr}}$ and for all $0 < \alpha < \delta(\beta_S)$ we have*

$$\alpha \mapsto S''_\alpha(\omega_{\beta_S} \| \omega_\beta) \leq 0. \tag{B1}$$

and

$$S_\infty(\omega_{\beta_S} \| \omega_\beta) \leq \log Z_\beta. \tag{B2}$$

Here, the critical value $\delta(\beta_S)$ is given by

$$\delta(\beta_S) = \frac{\log(Z_\beta)}{\mathcal{V}_\beta(\omega_{\beta_S}(H_S), H_S)} < 1. \tag{B3}$$

Proof. Let us first prove that the max-Renyi-divergence is upper bounded by the partition function at the environment temperature. Suppose that $\beta_S > \beta$ and let us write

$$S_\alpha(\omega_{\beta_S}(H_S) \| \omega_\beta(H_S)) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \left(\sum_i g_i \mathrm{e}^{-\alpha(\beta_S - \beta)E_i} (Z_\beta / Z_{\beta_S})^\alpha \frac{\mathrm{e}^{-\beta E_i}}{Z_\beta} \right) \tag{B4}$$

$$= \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \left(\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha(\beta_S - \beta)E_0} (Z_\beta / Z_{\beta_S})^\alpha \sum_i g_i \mathrm{e}^{-\alpha(\beta_S - \beta)(E_i - E_0)} \frac{\mathrm{e}^{-\beta E_i}}{Z_\beta} \right), \tag{B5}$$

where E_i denote the different energies of H_S, with degeneracies g_i. Assuming w.l.o.g. $E_0 = 0$, we write this as

$$S_\alpha(\omega_{\beta_S}(H_S)\|\omega_\beta(H_S)) = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}\log(Z_\beta/Z_{\beta_S}) + \frac{1}{\alpha-1}\log\left(1+\sum_{i>0}\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha(\beta_S-\beta)E_i}\frac{\mathrm{e}^{-\beta E_i}}{Z_\beta}\right). \tag{B6}$$

It is now obvious that in the limit we obtain

$$S_\infty(\omega_{\beta_S}(H_S)\|\omega_\beta(H_S)) = \lim_{\alpha\to\infty} S_\alpha(\omega_{\beta_S}(H_S)\|\omega_\beta(H_S)) = \log(Z_\beta) - \log(Z_{\beta_S}) \leq \log Z_\beta. \tag{B7}$$

As a second step let us find the condition for which $\delta(\beta_S) < 1$. To do that we express the vacancy as

$$\mathcal{V}_\beta(\omega_{\beta_S}(H_S), H_S) = \beta_S E_\beta - S_\beta + \log Z_{\beta_S}, \tag{B8}$$

where we write $S_\beta := S(\omega_\beta(H_S))$. We thus need that

$$\beta_S E_\beta - S(\omega_\beta(H_S)) > \log Z_\beta - \log Z_{\beta_S}. \tag{B9}$$

Relaxing to the sufficient criterion $\beta_S E_\beta - S_\beta > \log Z_\beta = S_\beta - \beta E_\beta$ we thus obtain

$$\beta_S > \frac{2S_\beta - \beta E_\beta}{E_\beta}. \tag{B10}$$

Let us now turn to the concavity. We will use the representation of S''_α proven in the next section, which is given by

$$S''_\alpha(\omega_{\beta_S}\|\omega_\beta) = \frac{2}{(1-\alpha)^3}\left(\log Z_{\beta_S} - \log Z_{\tilde\beta(\alpha)} + (\beta_S - \tilde\beta(\alpha))E_{\tilde\beta(\alpha)} - (\beta_S-\tilde\beta(\alpha))^2\mathrm{Var}(H)_{\tilde\beta(\alpha)}\right), \tag{B11}$$

where $\tilde\beta(\alpha) = \beta(1-\alpha)+\alpha\beta_S$. Since we are only interested in $\alpha < \delta(\beta_S) < 1$, we have $\beta \leq \tilde\beta(\alpha) < \beta_S$. We therefore have to show that the terms in the parenthesis are negative. Let us use that the average energy is monotonic with β and that $Z_{\tilde\beta(\alpha)} > 1$ to bound these terms as

$$\begin{aligned}\text{parenthesis} &\leq \log Z_{\beta_S} + (\beta_S - \tilde\beta(\alpha))E_{\tilde\beta(\alpha)} - (\beta_S-\tilde\beta(\alpha))^2\mathrm{Var}(H)_{\tilde\beta(\alpha)}\\ &\leq \log Z_{\beta_S} + (\beta_S - \beta)E_\beta - (\beta_S-\tilde\beta(\alpha))^2\mathrm{Var}(H)_{\tilde\beta(\alpha)}\\ &\leq \log(d) + (\beta_S-\beta)E_{\max} - (\beta_S-\tilde\beta(\alpha))^2\min_{x\in[\beta,\tilde\beta(\alpha)]}\mathrm{Var}(H)_x.\end{aligned} \tag{B12}$$

Now we bound $\tilde\beta(\alpha)$. To do that we use that $\tilde\beta(\alpha) \leq \tilde\beta(\delta(\beta_S)) =: \tilde\beta^*(\beta_S)$. It is clear that if we can bound $\tilde\beta^*(\beta_S)$ by a constant, the terms in the parenthesis become negative for some β_S since the second order term in β_S dominates. To see that $\tilde\beta^*(\beta_S)$ is indeed upper bounded by a constant, we again write the vacancy as

$$\mathcal{V}_\beta(\omega_{\beta_S}(H_S), H_S) = -S(\omega_\beta) + \beta_S E_\beta + \log Z_{\beta_S} \tag{B13}$$

to obtain

$$\beta^* := \lim_{\beta_S\to\infty}\tilde\beta^*(\beta_S) = \lim_{\beta_S\to\infty}\beta(1-\delta(\beta_S)) + \delta(\beta_S)\beta_S \tag{B14}$$

$$= \beta + \lim_{\beta_S\to\infty}\frac{\log Z_\beta}{\beta_S E_\beta + \log Z_{\beta_S} - S(\omega_\beta(H_S))}\beta_S = \beta + \frac{\log Z_\beta}{E_\beta}. \tag{B15}$$

This finishes the proof that β_{cr} as claimed in the Lemma exists. We also note that the function $\tilde\beta^*(\beta_S)$ is monotonically decreasing for all β_S such that $\tilde\beta^*(\beta_S) < 1$. Finally, note that eq. (B12) allows to give upper bounds β_c once one has lower bounds on the energy variance for inverse temperatures in the interval $[\beta, \beta^*]$. □

Appendix C: Renyi divergence between thermal states

Here, we will specialize to the situation where the resource states are thermal, with inverse temperature β_R. We now calculate the Renyi divergence for $\alpha < 1$ in this case. We first write:

$$S_\alpha(\omega_{\beta_R}||\omega_\beta) = -\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}\log Z_{\beta_R} + \log Z_\beta + \frac{1}{\alpha-1}\log \mathrm{Tr}(\mathrm{e}^{-\beta_R H\alpha}\mathrm{e}^{-\beta H(1-\alpha)}) \tag{C1}$$

$$= -\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}\log Z_{\beta_R} + \log Z_\beta + \frac{1}{\alpha-1}\log Z_{(\beta_R-\beta)\alpha+\beta} \tag{C2}$$

$$= -\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha-1}\log Z_{\beta_R} + \log Z_\beta + \frac{1}{\alpha-1}\log(Z_{(\beta_R-\beta)\alpha+\beta}/Z_{\beta_R}) \tag{C3}$$

$$= \log(Z_\beta/Z_{\beta_R}) + \frac{1}{\alpha-1}\log(Z_{(\beta_R-\beta)\alpha+\beta}/Z_{\beta_R}). \tag{C4}$$

We will now show that the function is convex provided $\beta_R < \beta$ and that the function $x \mapsto E_{\beta_R+x}$ is convex for $0 \leq x \leq \beta - \beta_R$. For the second derivative (with $\tilde{\beta} = (\beta_R - \beta)\alpha + \beta$) we obtain:

$$S_\alpha(\omega_{\beta_R}||\omega_\beta)'' = \frac{2}{(1-\alpha)^3}\log Z_{\beta_R} - \frac{2}{(1-\alpha)^3}\log Z_{\tilde{\beta}} - 2\frac{1}{(1-\alpha)^2}\partial_\alpha \log Z_{\tilde{\beta}} + \frac{1}{\alpha-1}\partial_\alpha^2 \log Z_{\tilde{\beta}} \tag{C5}$$

$$= \frac{2}{(1-\alpha)^3}\log Z_{\beta_R} - \frac{2}{(1-\alpha)^3}\log Z_{\tilde{\beta}} - 2\frac{1}{(1-\alpha)^2}(\beta-\beta_R)E_{\tilde{\beta}} - \frac{1}{1-\alpha}(\beta-\beta_R)^2\mathrm{Var}(H)_{\tilde{\beta}} \tag{C6}$$

$$= \frac{2}{(1-\alpha)^3}\left[\log Z_{\beta_R} - \log Z_{\tilde{\beta}} - (1-\alpha)(\beta-\beta_R)E_{\tilde{\beta}} - \frac{(1-\alpha)^2}{2}(\beta-\beta_R)^2\mathrm{Var}(H)_{\tilde{\beta}}\right]. \tag{C7}$$

Utilizing $(1-\alpha)(\beta-\beta_R) = \tilde{\beta} - \beta_R$, we can write this as

$$S_\alpha(\omega_{\beta_R}||\omega_\beta)'' = \frac{2}{(1-\alpha)^3}\left[\log Z_{\beta_R} - \log Z_{\tilde{\beta}} - (\tilde{\beta}-\beta_R)E_{\tilde{\beta}} - \frac{(\tilde{\beta}-\beta_R)^2}{2}\mathrm{Var}(H)_{\tilde{\beta}}\right]. \tag{C8}$$

Here, we have introduced the average energy E_β and the variance $\mathrm{Var}(H)_\beta = \langle H^2\rangle_\beta - \langle H\rangle_\beta^2$, which fulfill $\partial_x E_x = -\mathrm{Var}(H)_x$. With these expressions at hand, we will now show Thm. 3 and another result about about the convexity of Renyi divergences for sufficiently large reference temperature β.

1. Proof of Thm. 3

We need to show that the r.h.s. of (C8) is positive with the premise that $x \mapsto E_x$ is convex in $x \in [\beta_R, \beta]$, $\beta_R \leq \beta$ and $\alpha < 1$. This last condition on α implies that we need to show that

$$\log Z_{\beta_R} - \log Z_{\tilde{\beta}} \geq (\tilde{\beta}-\beta_R)E_{\tilde{\beta}} + \frac{(\tilde{\beta}-\beta_R)^2}{2}\mathrm{Var}(H)_{\tilde{\beta}}. \tag{C9}$$

We use an integral representation of the l.h.s:

$$\log Z_{\beta_R} - \log Z_{\tilde{\beta}} = -\int_0^{\tilde{\beta}-\beta_R}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}x}\log Z_{\beta_R+x}\,\mathrm{d}x = \int_0^{\tilde{\beta}-\beta_R} E_{\beta_R+x}\mathrm{d}x. \tag{C10}$$

Hence, we conclude that what needs to be shown is

$$\int_0^{\tilde{\beta}-\beta_R} E_{\beta_R+x}\mathrm{d}x \geq (\tilde{\beta}-\beta_R)E_{\tilde{\beta}} + \frac{(\tilde{\beta}-\beta_R)^2}{2}\mathrm{Var}(H)_{\tilde{\beta}}. \tag{C11}$$

Whether this inequality is satisfied, and thus, $S_\alpha(\rho_R\|\omega_\beta(H))$ is convex, is entirely determined by the function $x \mapsto E_x$. This is due to the fact that the derivative of E_x is given by $-\mathrm{Var}(H)_x$, so that the right hand side can be seen as a linear approximation to the function E_x. A geometrical interpretation is provided in Fig 2 showing that it is trivially satisfied when E_x is convex. This finishes the proof.



FIG. 2. The l.h.s. of (C11) is represented by the red striped area under the curve. The r.h.s. corresponds with the blue striped region. This can be seen by noting that the blue striped region can be decomposed onto a rectangle of sides $\tilde{\beta}-\beta_R$ and $E_{\tilde{\beta}}$ (light blue) which corresponds with the first term of the r.h.s of (C11); and a triangle that corresponds to the second term. If the function is E_x convex, the red region is always larger than the blue region.

As a final remark, although not useful to obtain bounds on the third law, we note that a completely analogous argument implies that if $\alpha<1$, E_x is convex but in contrast to the previous case $\beta_R\geq\beta$, then it is fulfilled that

$$\int_0^{\tilde{\beta}-\beta_R} E_{\beta_R+x}\mathrm{d}x \leq (\tilde{\beta}-\beta_R)E_{\tilde{\beta}}+\frac{(\tilde{\beta}-\beta_R)^2}{2}\mathrm{Var}(H)_{\tilde{\beta}}. \tag{C12}$$

This shows that in the case of resources colder than the bath, the function $S_\alpha(\rho_R\|\omega_\beta(H))$ is concave.

2. Very cold heat baths

We will now show that in the case of very cold heat baths (very large β) we also have that $S_\alpha(\omega_{\beta_R}\|\omega_\beta)$ is convex, and hence (10) becomes sufficient and necessary.

Theorem 7. *For any resource of the form $(\omega_{\beta_R}(H_R),H_R)$, given a fixed β_R there exist a sufficiently large value of β so that* (10) *is a sufficient and necessary condition for low temperature cooling.*

Proof. We only give a sketch and show that $S_\alpha(\omega_{\beta_R}\|\omega_\beta)$ is convex for values of $\alpha<\alpha_c$, where $\alpha_c<1$ is chosen arbitrarily. Recalling Eq. C11, we then need to show that

$$\int_0^{\tilde{\beta}-\beta_R} E_{\beta_R+x}\mathrm{d}x \geq (\tilde{\beta}-\beta_R)E_{\tilde{\beta}}+\frac{(\tilde{\beta}-\beta_R)^2}{2}\mathrm{Var}(H)_{\tilde{\beta}}. \tag{C13}$$

Note that in the limit of large β the scaling of the r.h.s. of (C13) is such that $\tilde{\beta}-\beta_R=(1-\alpha)(\beta-\beta_R)$ scales proportionally to β, while $E_{\tilde{\beta}}$ and $\mathrm{Var}(H)_{\tilde{\beta}}$ scale as $e^{-k\beta}$. Therefore, the r.h.s. of (C13) approaches zero as $\beta\to\infty$ whereas the l.h.s. grows monotonically with β. Hence, (C13) is fulfilled which concludes the proof. □

Appendix D: Equidistant levels

Here, we consider the particular case of a system with $M+1$ equidistant levels and show that the function E_β is convex. The energy-gap between subsequent levels is Δ and we set the ground-state energy to zero. The energy E_β then takes the form

$$E_\beta=\frac{1}{\mathrm{e}^{\beta\Delta}-1}\Delta-\frac{M+1}{\mathrm{e}^{(M+1)\Delta\beta}-1}\Delta. \tag{D1}$$

In particular, for $M\to\infty$ we obtain results for the harmonic oscillator and for $M=1$ for a qubit. We have to prove that the second derivative is positive, i.e.,

$$E''_\beta=\frac{1}{8}\Delta^3\left[\frac{\sinh(\beta\Delta)}{\sinh(\beta\Delta/2)^4}-\underbrace{(M+1)^3\frac{\sinh((M+1)\beta\Delta)}{\sinh((M+1)\beta\Delta/2)^4}}_{=:f(\beta,M+1)}\right]\geq 0. \tag{D2}$$

For $M = 0$ this is clearly true. We will set $M + 1 =: \gamma$ and show that $\partial_\gamma f(\beta, \gamma) \leq 0$. We have

$$\partial_\gamma f(\beta,\gamma) = -\gamma^2 \frac{1}{\sinh(\gamma\beta\Delta/2)^4} \left[\gamma\beta\Delta(2+\cosh(\gamma\beta\Delta)) - 3\sinh(\gamma\beta\Delta)\right]. \tag{D3}$$

In the following, set $\gamma\beta\Delta = x$. Due to the negative pre-factor, we are done if we can show

$$x(2+\cosh(x)) - 3\sinh(x) \geq 0. \tag{D4}$$

We will show this using a Taylor-expansion:

$$2x + x\cosh(x) - 3\sinh(x) = 2x + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} x^{2n+1}\left(\frac{1}{(2n)!} - \frac{3}{(2n+1)!}\right) \tag{D5}$$

$$= 2x + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} x^{2n+1}\left(\frac{((2n+1)-3)(2n)!}{(2n)!(2n+1)!}\right) \tag{D6}$$

$$= 2x - 2x + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x^{2n+1}\left(\frac{((2n+1)-3)(2n)!}{(2n)!(2n+1)!}\right) \tag{D7}$$

$$\geq 0. \tag{D8}$$

Appendix E: The work source model

Here we show that a work source of the form (ρ_R^w, H_R^w) as given in the main text fulfills the second law of thermodynamics. Let us consider an arbitrary system (ρ_S, H_S) and let us consider catalytic thermal operations on SW. We will show that the maximum amount of mean energy that one can store on the work source is bounded by the initial non-equilibrium free energy of S. Let us recall, see for instance Ref. [16], that the free energy difference is given by

$$\Delta F_\beta(\rho, H) := 1/\beta S(\rho\|\omega_\beta(H)) = F(\rho, H) - F(\omega_\beta(H)), \tag{E1}$$

where $F(\rho, H) = \mathrm{Tr}(\rho H) - \frac{1}{\beta}S(\rho)$ is the free energy.

The protocol of work extraction is a transition of the form

$$\rho_{SW}^i := \rho_S \otimes \rho_R^w \to \rho_{SW}^f = \mathcal{E}(\rho_{SW}^i) \tag{E2}$$

where $\mathcal{E}$ is any channel that has the Gibbs state as a fixed point. Monotonicity of ΔF_β under channels of the form $\mathcal{E}$ imply that

$$\Delta F_\beta^f := \Delta F_\beta(\rho_S R^f, H_S + H_R) \leq \Delta F_\beta(\rho_{SR}^i, H_S + H_R) := \Delta F_\beta^i. \tag{E3}$$

Combining this last equation with super-additivity and additivity of the relative entropy one can easily find, following a similar reasoning as in Ref. [16], that

$$\Delta E_w \leq \Delta F_\beta(\rho_S, H_S) \tag{E4}$$

where $\Delta E_R = \mathrm{Tr}(\mathbb{I} \otimes H_R^w \ \rho_{SR}^f) - \mathrm{Tr}(\mathbb{I} \otimes H_R^w \ \rho_{SR}^i)$ is the mean energy stored in the work source R.

Appendix F: Arbitrary target-states close to the ground-state

In this section we prove a result similar to our general sufficient condition for cooling, but where we consider target states of the form

$$\rho_\epsilon = (1-\epsilon)\ |0\rangle\langle 0| + \epsilon\rho^\perp, \quad \epsilon \ll 1. \tag{F1}$$

where $\rho^\perp$ is a density matrix which has full rank on the subspace orthogonal to the ground-state $|0\rangle$ and commutes with the Hamiltonian H_S.

Theorem 8 (General sufficient condition for cooling)**.** *For every choice of β, H_S and $\rho^\perp$ as above, there is a critical $\epsilon_{\rm cr} > 0$ such that for any $\epsilon < \epsilon_{\rm cr}$ the condition*

$$\mathcal{V}_\beta(\rho_R, H_R) + \tilde{K}(\epsilon, \beta, \rho_R, H_R, H_S, \rho^\perp) \geq \mathcal{V}_\beta(\rho_\epsilon, H_S) \tag{F2}$$

is sufficient *for cooling. The function $\tilde{K}$ has the property $\tilde{K}(\epsilon, \beta, \rho_R, H_R, \rho^\perp) \to 0$ as $\epsilon \to \infty$ for any fixed $\beta, H_R, \rho_R, \rho^\perp$ and H_S.*

The proof of this theorem is essentially identical to the one of Theorem 2. The only difference is that instead of Lemma 5, we use the following Lemma:

Lemma 9 (Concavity close to ground-state)**.** *Let H_S be a d-dimensional Hamiltonian with ground-state $|0\rangle$ and $H\,|0\rangle = 0$. Let $\beta > 0$ be fixed and consider the state*

$$\rho_\epsilon = (1-\epsilon)\,|0\rangle\langle 0| + \epsilon\rho^\perp, \tag{F3}$$

with $\mathrm{rank}(\rho^\perp) = d-1$, $\rho^\perp\,|0\rangle = 0$ and $[\rho^\perp, H_S] = 0$. Then there exists an $\epsilon_{\rm cr} > 0$ such that for all $\alpha < \delta(\epsilon)$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}^2}{\mathrm{d}\alpha^2} S_\alpha(\rho_\epsilon || \omega_\beta(H_S)) < 0, \quad \forall \epsilon < \epsilon_{\rm cr}. \tag{F4}$$

Here, $\delta(\epsilon)$ fulfills

$$\delta(\epsilon) = \frac{\log Z_\beta}{\mathcal{V}_\beta(\rho_\epsilon, H_S)} < 1, \quad \forall \epsilon < \epsilon_{\rm cr}. \tag{F5}$$

We will now proof this Lemma. Let us then express the Renyi-divergence as

$$S_\alpha(\rho_\epsilon || \omega_\beta(H_S)) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log\left((1-\epsilon)^\alpha + \epsilon^\alpha \mathrm{Tr}((\rho^\perp)^\alpha \mathrm{e}^{-\beta H_S(1-\alpha)})\right) + \log(Z_S) \tag{F6}$$

$$=: \frac{1}{\alpha - 1}\log(f(\alpha)) + \log(Z_S). \tag{F7}$$

As is apparent from the expression, in the following we will often encounter the functions

$$\tilde{f}(\alpha) := \mathrm{Tr}((\rho^\perp)^\alpha \mathrm{e}^{-\beta H(1-\alpha)}), \tag{F8}$$

$$f_\epsilon(\alpha) := \mathrm{Tr}(\rho_\epsilon^\alpha \mathrm{e}^{-\beta H(1-\alpha)}) = (1-\epsilon)^\alpha + \epsilon^\alpha \tilde{f}(\alpha). \tag{F9}$$

It is useful to remember from the main text that $\rho^\perp$ is a normalized quantum state that commutes with H and has rank $d-1$. In the following we will also often write S_α instead of $S_\alpha(\rho_\epsilon||\omega_\beta(H_S))$ and simply f_ϵ or $f_{\epsilon,\alpha}$ instead of $f_\epsilon(\alpha)$ to simplify the notation (similarly for $\tilde{f}$). While f_ϵ and $\tilde{f}$ are structurally essentially the same, it is important to keep in mind that only f_ϵ, and not $\tilde{f}$, depends on ϵ.

We now have to prove that S_α is concave for small enough ϵ, i.e., have to show that there exists a $\epsilon_{\rm cr} > 0$ such that its second derivative is negative for $\epsilon < \epsilon_{\rm cr}$. The second derivative of S_α can be computed straightforwardly and gives

$$S_\alpha'' = -\frac{2}{(1-\alpha)^3}\log f_\epsilon - \frac{2}{(1-\alpha)^2}\frac{f_\epsilon'}{f_\epsilon} + \frac{1}{1-\alpha}\left(\left(\frac{f_\epsilon'}{f_\epsilon}\right)^2 - \frac{f_\epsilon''}{f_\epsilon}\right). \tag{F10}$$

To go on we need to establish a few properties of functions like f_ϵ and $\tilde{f}$. We will collect these properties in a series of Lemmata.

Lemma 10. *Let ρ be a quantum state and σ be a positive semi-definite operator with $[\rho, \sigma] = 0$. Define $f(\alpha) := \mathrm{Tr}(\rho^\alpha \sigma^{1-\alpha})$. Then*

$$(f')^2 - f''f \leq 0, \quad 0 < \alpha < 1. \tag{F11}$$

Proof. A simple calculation shows that

$$f'(\alpha) = \mathrm{Tr}(\rho^\alpha(\log(\rho) - \log(\sigma))\sigma^{1-\alpha}), \tag{F12}$$

$$f''(\alpha) = \mathrm{Tr}(\rho^\alpha(\log(\rho) - \log(\sigma))^2\sigma^{1-\alpha}). \tag{F13}$$

We now use the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality $|\mathrm{Tr}(A^\dagger B\rho)|^2 \leq \mathrm{Tr}(A^\dagger A\rho)\mathrm{Tr}(B^\dagger B\rho)$ with $A = \rho^{-\alpha/2}(\log(\rho) - \log(\sigma))\sigma^{\alpha/2}$ and $B = \rho^{-\alpha/2}\sigma^{\alpha/2}$ to obtain (note the change from α to $1-\alpha$)

$$\begin{aligned} f'(1-\alpha)^2 &= \mathrm{Tr}\left(\rho^{-\alpha/2}(\log(\rho) - \log(\sigma))\sigma^{\alpha/2}\rho^{-\alpha/2}\sigma^{\alpha/2}\rho\right)^2 \\ &\leq \mathrm{Tr}\left(\rho^{-\alpha}(\log(\rho) - \log(\sigma))^2\sigma^{\alpha}\rho\right)\mathrm{Tr}(\rho^{-\alpha}\sigma^{\alpha}\rho) \\ &= \mathrm{Tr}\left(\rho^{1-\alpha}(\log(\rho) - \log(\sigma))^2\sigma^{\alpha}\right)\mathrm{Tr}\left(\rho^{1-\alpha}\sigma^{\alpha}\right) \\ &= f''(1-\alpha)f(1-\alpha). \end{aligned} \tag{F14}$$

□

Lemma 11. *Let H be a Hamiltonian with ground-state energy $E_0 = 0$ and let $sigma$ be a quantum state with $[\sigma, H] = 0$. Then*

$$f(\alpha) := \mathrm{Tr}(\sigma^\alpha \mathrm{e}^{-\beta H(1-\alpha)}) \leq Z, \quad 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1. \tag{F15}$$

Proof. From the calculation of the previous Lemma we see that the second derivative of f is the trace of a product of positive commuting operators. Hence it is always positive and therefore f is convex. But since $H \geq 0$ we have $f(0) = Z \geq 1 = f(1)$ and from convexity we get $f(\alpha) \leq Z$. □

Note that due to our assumption about the groundstate energy we have $Z_S \geq 1$ and from the above Lemma we know $f_\epsilon \leq Z_S$. We will now show that for every $0 < \alpha_c' < 1$, we have $1 \leq f_\epsilon(\alpha) \leq Z_S$ if ϵ is small enough and $\alpha < \alpha_c'$.

Lemma 12. *For any $0 < \alpha_c' < 1$ there exists a critical $\epsilon_{\mathrm{cr}}' > 0$, such that for all $\epsilon < \epsilon_{\mathrm{cr}}'$ we have*

$$f_\epsilon(\alpha) := \mathrm{Tr}(\rho_\epsilon^\alpha \mathrm{e}^{-\beta H(1-\alpha)}) \geq 1, \quad 0 \leq \alpha < \alpha_c'. \tag{F16}$$

Proof. Assume some $0 < \alpha < \alpha_c'$. Using that $\tilde{f}$ is independent of ϵ and positive, we can lower bound it by some $\tilde{f}_{\min} > 0$. Also, $(1-\alpha)^\alpha$ is monotonically decreasing with α for $0 < \alpha < 1$. We therefore get the lower bound

$$f_\epsilon(\alpha) = (1-\epsilon)^\alpha + \epsilon^\alpha \tilde{f}(\alpha) \geq (1-\epsilon) + \epsilon^\alpha \tilde{f}_{\min} = 1 + \epsilon(\epsilon^{\alpha-1}\tilde{f}_{\min} - 1). \tag{F17}$$

Thus for $\epsilon < \epsilon_{\mathrm{cr}}'(\alpha_c') := \left(\tilde{f}_{\min}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha_c}}$ we have $f_\epsilon(\alpha) \geq 1$. □

Remark 13. *Due to the preceding Lemma, we will in the following take the (somewhat arbitrary) choice $\alpha_c' = 1/3$ and only consider $\alpha < \alpha_c'$ as well as values of $\epsilon < \epsilon_{\mathrm{cr}}'(\alpha_c')$. Since later we are anyway only interested in arbitrarily small values of ϵ and $\alpha \leq \delta(\epsilon)$, this is no obstruction.*

Lemma 14. *For all $\alpha < \alpha_c'$ and $\epsilon < \epsilon_{\mathrm{cr}}'$ we have $f_\epsilon'(\alpha) \leq 0$.*

Proof. Follows from $f_\epsilon(\alpha) \geq 1$ for all $\alpha \leq \alpha_c'$ together with the facts that $f_\epsilon(1) = 1$,$f_\epsilon(0) = Z_S$ and that f_ϵ is convex. □

We are now in position to go on with the proof of the asymptotic concavity. First, we will further restrict the values of α by choosing arbitrarily $\alpha_c < \alpha_c' = 1/3$ and restricting to $\alpha \leq \alpha_c$. The reason for this will become clear later in the proof.

Considering eq. (F10) and using $Z_S \geq f_\epsilon \geq 1$ as well as Lemma 10, we can upper now bound the second derivative as

$$S_\alpha'' \leq -\frac{2}{(1-\alpha)^2}\frac{f_\epsilon'}{f_\epsilon} + \frac{1}{(1-\alpha)f_\epsilon^2}\left((f_\epsilon')^2 - f_\epsilon'' f_\epsilon\right) \tag{F18}$$

$$\leq -\frac{2}{(1-\alpha_c)^2}\frac{f_\epsilon'}{f_\epsilon} + \frac{1}{Z_S^2}\left((f_\epsilon')^2 - f_\epsilon'' f_\epsilon\right). \tag{F19}$$

One might be tempted to use Lemma 10 and simply upper bound the second term by zero, but that bound would be too weak, since the first term diverges as $\log(1/\epsilon)$. We will therefore now have to do a more detailed calculation. We first compute the derivatives of f_ϵ:

$$f_{\epsilon,\alpha}' = (1-\epsilon)^\alpha \log(1-\epsilon) + \log(\epsilon)\epsilon^\alpha \tilde{f}_\alpha + \epsilon^\alpha \tilde{f}_\alpha', \tag{F20}$$

$$\begin{aligned} (f_{\epsilon,\alpha}')^2 = {} & (1-\epsilon)^{2\alpha}\log(1-\epsilon)^2 + \log(\epsilon)^2\epsilon^{2\alpha}\tilde{f}_\alpha^2 + \epsilon^{2\alpha}(\tilde{f}_\alpha')^2 + 2(1-\epsilon)^\alpha \log(1-\epsilon)\log(\epsilon)\epsilon^\alpha \tilde{f}_\alpha \\ & + 2(1-\epsilon)^\alpha \log(1-\epsilon)\epsilon^\alpha \tilde{f}_\alpha' + 2\log(\epsilon)\epsilon^{2\alpha}\tilde{f}_\alpha \tilde{f}_\alpha'. \end{aligned} \tag{F21}$$

$$f_{\epsilon,\alpha}'' = (1-\epsilon)^\alpha \log(1-\epsilon)^2 + \log(\epsilon)^2\epsilon^\alpha \tilde{f}_\alpha + 2\log(\epsilon)\epsilon^\alpha \tilde{f}_\alpha' + \epsilon^\alpha \tilde{f}_\alpha''. \tag{F22}$$

These give

$$
\begin{aligned}
(f'_{\epsilon,\alpha})^2 - f''_{\epsilon,\alpha}\epsilon^\alpha \tilde{f}_\alpha &= (1-\epsilon)^{2\alpha}\log(1-\epsilon)^2 + \log(\epsilon)^2\epsilon^{2\alpha}\tilde{f}_\alpha^2 + \epsilon^{2\alpha}(\tilde{f}'_\alpha)^2 + 2(1-\epsilon)^\alpha \log(1-\epsilon)\log(\epsilon)\epsilon^\alpha \tilde{f}_\alpha \\
&\quad + 2(1-\epsilon)^\alpha \log(1-\epsilon)\epsilon^\alpha \tilde{f}'_\alpha + 2\log(\epsilon)\epsilon^{2\alpha}\tilde{f}_\alpha \tilde{f}'_\alpha \\
&\quad - \epsilon^\alpha \tilde{f}_\alpha \left((1-\epsilon)^\alpha \log(1-\epsilon)^2 + \log(\epsilon)^2\epsilon^\alpha \tilde{f}_\alpha + 2\log(\epsilon)\epsilon^\alpha \tilde{f}'_\alpha + \epsilon^\alpha \tilde{f}''_\alpha\right) \qquad \text{(F23)} \\
&= \log(1-\epsilon)^2(1-\epsilon)^\alpha \left((1-\epsilon)^\alpha - \epsilon^\alpha \tilde{f}_\alpha\right) + \epsilon^{2\alpha}(\tilde{f}'_\alpha)^2 \\
&\quad + 2(1-\epsilon)^\alpha \log(1-\epsilon)\log(\epsilon)\epsilon^\alpha \tilde{f}_\alpha + 2(1-\epsilon)^\alpha \log(1-\epsilon)\epsilon^\alpha \tilde{f}'_\alpha - \epsilon^{2\alpha}\tilde{f}''_\alpha \tilde{f}_\alpha \qquad \text{(F24)} \\
&= \log(1-\epsilon)^2(1-\epsilon)^\alpha \left((1-\epsilon)^\alpha - \epsilon^\alpha \tilde{f}_\alpha\right) + 2(1-\epsilon)^\alpha \log(1-\epsilon)\epsilon^\alpha \left(\log(\epsilon)\tilde{f}_\alpha + \epsilon^\alpha \tilde{f}'_\alpha\right) \\
&\quad + \epsilon^{2\alpha}\left((\tilde{f}'_\alpha)^2 - \tilde{f}''_\alpha \tilde{f}_\alpha\right). \qquad \text{(F25)}
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
(f'_{\epsilon,\alpha})^2 - f''_{\epsilon,\alpha} f_\alpha &= -(1-\epsilon)^\alpha f''_{\epsilon,\alpha} + \log(1-\epsilon)^2(1-\epsilon)^\alpha \left((1-\epsilon)^\alpha - \epsilon^\alpha \tilde{f}_\alpha\right) \\
&\quad + 2(1-\epsilon)^\alpha \log(1-\epsilon)\epsilon^\alpha \left(\log(\epsilon)\tilde{f}_\alpha + \epsilon^\alpha \tilde{f}'_\alpha\right) + \epsilon^{2\alpha}\left((\tilde{f}'_\alpha)^2 - \tilde{f}''_\alpha \tilde{f}_\alpha\right). \qquad \text{(F26)}
\end{aligned}
$$

Note in particular that the last term is negative semi-definite due to Lemma 10.

Let us now also write $0 < 1/k_c := (1-\alpha_c)^2 < 1$. Inserting the previous result into eq. (F18) we then obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
S''_\alpha &\leq -2k_c f'_{\epsilon,\alpha} + \frac{1}{Z^2}\left(\left(f'_{\epsilon,\alpha}\right)^2 - f''_{\epsilon,\alpha} f_\alpha\right) \qquad \text{(F27)} \\
&\leq -2k_c f'_{\epsilon,\alpha} + \frac{1}{Z^2}\Big(-(1-\epsilon)^\alpha f''_{\epsilon,\alpha} + \log(1-\epsilon)^2(1-\epsilon)^\alpha \left((1-\epsilon)^\alpha - \epsilon^\alpha \tilde{f}_\alpha\right) \\
&\qquad +2(1-\epsilon)^\alpha \log(1-\epsilon)\epsilon^\alpha \left(\log(\epsilon)\tilde{f}_\alpha + \epsilon^\alpha \tilde{f}'_\alpha\right)\Big) \qquad \text{(F28)} \\
&\leq -2k_c f'_{\epsilon,\alpha} + \frac{1}{Z^2}\Big(-(1-\epsilon) f''_{\epsilon,\alpha} + \log(1-\epsilon)^2\left(1-(1-\epsilon)\epsilon\tilde{f}_\alpha\right) \\
&\qquad +2\log(1-\epsilon)\left(\log(\epsilon)\tilde{f}_\alpha + \epsilon^{2\alpha}(1-\epsilon)^\alpha \tilde{f}'_\alpha\right)\Big) \qquad \text{(F29)}
\end{aligned}
$$

We now lower bound f'_ϵ and f''_ϵ as

$$
\begin{aligned}
f'_{\epsilon,\alpha} &\geq \log(1-\epsilon) + \log(\epsilon)\tilde{f}_\alpha + \tilde{f}'_\alpha \qquad \text{(F30)} \\
f''_{\epsilon,\alpha} &\geq (1-\epsilon)\log(1-\epsilon)^2 + \log(\epsilon)^2\epsilon^{\alpha_c}\tilde{f}_\alpha + 2\log(\epsilon)\epsilon^\alpha \tilde{f}'_\alpha + \epsilon\tilde{f}''_\alpha. \qquad \text{(F31)}
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that we cannot easily bound the terms involving $\tilde{f}'_\alpha$ since we do not know the sign of $\tilde{f}'_\alpha$. However, we emphasize again that $\tilde{f}$ is independent of ϵ and can hence essentially be treated as constant. Putting in the bounds then yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
S''_\alpha &\leq -2k_c(\log(1-\epsilon) + \log(\epsilon)\tilde{f}_\alpha + \tilde{f}'_\alpha) - \frac{1-\epsilon}{Z^2}\left((1-\epsilon)\log(1-\epsilon)^2 + \log(\epsilon)^2\epsilon^{\alpha_c}\tilde{f}_\alpha + 2\log(\epsilon)\epsilon^\alpha \tilde{f}'_\alpha + \epsilon\tilde{f}''_\alpha\right) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{Z^2}\left(\log(1-\epsilon)^2\left(1-(1-\epsilon)\epsilon\tilde{f}_\alpha\right) + 2\log(1-\epsilon)\left(\log(\epsilon)\tilde{f}_\alpha + \epsilon^{2\alpha}(1-\epsilon)^\alpha \tilde{f}'_\alpha\right)\right) \qquad \text{(F32)} \\
&= \log(\epsilon)\tilde{f}_\alpha\left(\frac{2}{Z^2}\log(1-\epsilon) - \frac{1-\epsilon}{Z^2}2\epsilon^\alpha \frac{\tilde{f}'_\alpha}{\tilde{f}_\alpha} - \frac{1-\epsilon}{Z^2}\log(\epsilon)\epsilon^{\alpha_c} - \frac{2}{(1-\alpha_c)^2}\right) \\
&\quad + \log(1-\epsilon)\left(-\frac{2}{(1-\alpha_c)^2} - \frac{(1-\epsilon)^2}{Z^2}\log(1-\epsilon) + \frac{1-(1-\epsilon)\epsilon\tilde{f}_\alpha}{Z^2}\log(1-\epsilon) + \frac{2}{Z^2}\epsilon^{2\alpha}(1-\epsilon)^\alpha \tilde{f}'_\alpha\right) \\
&\quad - \frac{2}{(1-\alpha_c)^2}\tilde{f}'_\alpha - \frac{(1-\epsilon)\epsilon}{Z^2}\tilde{f}''_\alpha \qquad \text{(F33)} \\
&\leq \log(\epsilon)\tilde{f}_\alpha\left(\frac{2}{Z^2}\log(1-\epsilon) - \frac{1-\epsilon}{Z^2}2\epsilon^\alpha \frac{\tilde{f}'_\alpha}{\tilde{f}_\alpha} - \frac{1-\epsilon}{Z^2}\log(\epsilon)\epsilon^{\alpha_c} - \frac{2}{(1-\alpha_c)^2}\right) + M(\epsilon, H, \beta, \rho^\perp) - K(\alpha_c, H, \beta, \rho^\perp), \\
&\qquad \text{(F34)}
\end{aligned}
$$

where M goes to zero as ϵ goes to zero and K is independent of ϵ. Also note that M is bounded and independent of α (due to the boundedness of $\tilde{f}_\alpha$ and its derivatives). Let us define $m(\alpha_c) = \max_{\alpha \leq \alpha_c} \tilde{f}'_\alpha / \tilde{f}_\alpha$. Since $\alpha_c < 1/2$ we can simplify the bound to

$$S''_\alpha \leq \log(\epsilon) \frac{\tilde{f}_\alpha}{Z^2} \left(2\log(1-\epsilon) - 2(1-\epsilon)\epsilon^\alpha m(\alpha_c) - (1-\epsilon)\log(\epsilon)\epsilon^{\alpha_c} - 8Z^2\right) + M(\epsilon, H, \beta, \rho^\perp) - K(\alpha_c, H, \beta, \rho^\perp). \quad \text{(F35)}$$

Clearly S''_α can be made negative by taking ϵ and α_c arbitrarily small since the dominant term in the bracket goes as $-\log(\epsilon)$. However, since our objective is to upper bound S_α by $\mathcal{V}_\beta(\rho_\epsilon, H_S)\alpha$ for all $\alpha \leq \alpha_c$, we also need that $\mathcal{V}_\beta(\rho_\epsilon, H_S)\alpha_c \geq \log Z_S$ and hence $\alpha_c \geq \log(Z_S)/\mathcal{V}_\beta(\rho_\epsilon, H_S)$. Hence we choose $\alpha_c = \delta(\epsilon) = \log Z_S / \mathcal{V}_\beta(\rho_\epsilon, H_S)$ and hope for the best. The vacancy is given by:

$$\mathcal{V}_\beta(\rho_\epsilon, H_S) = -\log(1-\epsilon)\frac{1}{Z_S} + \frac{Z_S - 1}{Z_S}\log(1/\epsilon) + C_1(\rho^\perp, \beta, H_S), \quad \text{(F36)}$$

where C_1 does not depend on ϵ. Hence

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \epsilon^{\delta(\epsilon)} = \frac{1}{Z_S^{\frac{Z_S}{Z_S - 1}}} \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} -(1-\epsilon)\log(\epsilon)\epsilon^{\delta(\epsilon)} = +\infty. \quad \text{(F37)}$$

Since the other terms in the first bracket in S''_α go to zero as $\epsilon \to 0$ and K is independent of ϵ, we can thus find a finite ϵ_{cr} such that

$$S''_\alpha \leq 0, \quad \alpha \leq \delta(\epsilon_{cr}). \quad \text{(F38)}$$

This finishes the proof. □